

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-17 and 25-41 are cancelled without prejudice, and Claim 24 is rewritten in independent form. Independent Claims 18 and 42 are amended to better define subject matter the Applicants believe patentable over the applied art. The substance of Claims 45 and 46 is incorporated into amended Claim 42. Claims 2, 3, 6, 18-24, 42-44, and 47 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

The Applicants, while agreeing in principle with the Examiner's summary of applicable law set forth in the second complete paragraph on page 3 of the last Office Action, respectfully point out that the teachings of individual references (in a cited combination) must nonetheless be considered to evaluate what those references in combination would fairly teach to one of ordinary skill.

Turning to the amended claims, the Applicants submit that independent Claims 18 and 42 define a combination of method steps and a system, respectively, including elements not taught or suggested by the combination of *Brandt* (US 6,714,979) in view of *Hartmann* (US 2003/0055976). Stated differently, merely providing *Brandt's* output to a printer emulator suggested by *Hartmann* would not meet the overall combination of limitations set forth in Claims 18 and 42.

Claim 18 defines a method including the elements of the embodiment described, e.g., in paragraphs 0033-0040 of the specification. Paraphrasing somewhat the limitations of Claim 18, that method comprises receiving customer data and a mainframe database system, generating a report for customer requests based on the data in the mainframe system, and providing summaries of at least one such generated report to a computer acting as a printer emulator. Selected data from those report summaries is imported into a spreadsheet (specification paragraph 0035).

The method of Claim 18 next connects to the mainframe system with a computer acting as a terminal emulator (paragraph 0038). After connecting to the mainframe system, the terminal emulator submits a print request to the mainframe system to print selected reports, based on information in the spreadsheet for at least one of the generated reports previously provided to the printer emulator by the mainframe system (paragraph 0039). Those selected reports are provided by the mainframe system to the printer

emulator, and the provided reports are saved as word processing documents (paragraph 0040). The reports are saved on a storage device.

Hartmann, considered with *Brandt*, would not have suggested any part of Claim 18 beyond possibly providing summaries to a printer emulator.

Claim 18 thus defines an overall combination of method limitations that goes well beyond merely supplying mainframe output to a printer emulator as the rejection suggests. The overall combination including importing to a spreadsheet selected data initially provided from the mainframe to the printer emulator, and then submitting a print request to the mainframe by way of a terminal emulator for selected reports based on information in that spreadsheet, followed by providing those selected reports from the mainframe to the printer emulator where the provided reports are saved as word processing documents and made available on a storage device, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from *Brandt* in view of *Hartmann*. Neither reference, singly or taken together, would have taught anything beyond providing summaries to a printer emulator. Accordingly, Claim 18 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over that combination of references.

Claim 42 defines a system for managing customer usage reports. This system comprises a combination of structural and functional elements having the limitations discussed above with respect to Claim 18. In particular, the system of Claim 42 requires that the mainframe system generate a file comprising report numbers and selected reports, that file is printed to a computer comprising a printer emulator, and that computer imports to a spreadsheet selected data from a generated report received via the printer emulator.

A terminal emulator (comprised by the computer including the *printer* emulator) then communicates with the mainframe system in response to a print request for at least one selected report based on data in spreadsheet. The selected report or reports are printed from the mainframe to the printer emulator, and those printed reports are stored on a file server.

Once again, a system including the overall combination of structural and functional elements recited in Claim 42 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, based on *Brandt* in view of *Hartmann*. Merely providing a terminal emulator to

S/N 09/995,042

receive output from *Brandt's* data warehousing system fails to meet that overall combination of elements. Accordingly, Claim 42 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the applied art.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: August 12, 2005

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

39262

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE